

REMARKS

Applicants express heartfelt thanks to the Examiner for withdrawing the claim rejections set out in the July 28, 2005 Office Action. However, in the October 17, 2005 Office Action, pending claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) as being anticipated by Archibald, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,928,578 (Archibald). As a preliminary matter, Applicants would like to remind the Examiner that the Archibald publication was previously considered in the PTO 1449 of May 24, 2004. Regardless, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 11, 21, and 22 generally recite the limitations of independent claim 1 which states the following:

In a RAID data storage system comprising a RAID stripe, wherein the stripe comprises a plurality of stripe units including a first stripe unit, a method comprising:
receiving a request to read data, wherein the request is received from a computer system in data communication with the RAID data storage system;
reading first parity data corresponding to the first stripe unit data in response to receiving the request;
generating new first parity data corresponding to the first stripe unit data, wherein the new first parity data is generated as a function of the first stripe unit data;
comparing the first parity data with the new first parity data;
returning data of the first stripe unit to the computer system if the first parity data compares equally to the new first parity data.

In the Office Action, Archibald, col. 7, lines 39-49 is cited in an attempt to demonstrate the disclosure of Applicants' independent claim 1. However, as demonstrated by the following, the cited portion of Archibald fails to teach or disclose Applicants' claim 1.

In the data checking portion, first, sectors (*data sectors and parity sectors*) of a data stripe are read. This reading may involve reading all data and parity sectors depending upon the granularity permitted (or desired) for regions of the data and parity. In one embodiment, all data and parity sectors are read. For each sector stripe, beginning with a first selected sector stripe, a data check code sub-sector stripe (DCCss) is calculated or otherwise generated for the selected sector stripe using the DCCds metadata for each data sector. Next, a *comparison is made between the calculated DCCss and the previously stored DCCss* to determine if they are the same.

(Archibald, col. 7, lines 39-49, emphasis added)

Regarding the claimed “receiving a request to read data ... from a computer system in data communication with the RAID storage system,” the cited portion of Archibald merely states that “data sectors and parity sectors” of a data stripe are read; the reading of data does not appear to be in response to any request at all. Further, the cited portion of Archibald states that this “reading may involve reading all data and parity sectors depending upon the granularity permitted” which discloses nothing at all regarding a request to read data as required by independent claim 1. In addition, regarding the claimed “reading first parity data corresponding to the first stripe unit data,” the cited portion of Archibald discloses reading all data and parity sectors, but fails to teach or disclose a correspondence between a parity sector and a data sector.

Regarding the claimed “returning data of the first stripe unit to the computer system,” the cited portion of Archibald does not disclose returning data to a computer system at all, much less returning data to a computer system if parity data meets a particular condition as recited in Applicants’ claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons and because independent claims 11, 21, and 22 claim generally the same subject matter as independent claim 1, Applicants urge the Examiner to

withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 22 as being anticipated by Archibald. As dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 add limitations to otherwise allowable base claims, Applicants also respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant(s) submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, on December 13, 2005.


Attorney for Applicant(s)

12/13/05
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Russell C. Scott
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 43,103
Telephone: (512) 439-5089
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099